International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal

The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies
Article Type:	Empirical articles
Corresponding Author:	Antonio L. Leal-Rodríguez, Ph.D. Universidad de Sevilla Seville, SPAIN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universidad de Sevilla
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Murad Ali, Ph.D.
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Murad Ali, Ph.D.
	Imran Ali, Ph.D.
	Gema Albort-Morant, Ph.D.
	Antonio L. Leal-Rodríguez, Ph.D.
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	Employees' wellbeing is nowadays at the core of organizational HRM strategies, as firms have turned to grasp the significance of human resources while attaining competitive advantages. However, some external factors like localization of labor can adversely influence expatriate employees' perception of wellbeing at the firm level. The current study examines the influence of job insecurity on employee's perceptions of wellbeing, and their involvement in knowledge sharing or knowledge hiding strategies. The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working at different organizations in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian government is currently implementing localization policies, and the organizations are increasingly replacing their expatriate employees with local employees in order to avoid governmental penalties. Therefore, it is important to examine how this job insecurity might be affecting expatriate employees' perceptions of wellbeing and knowledge management behaviors. The study uses Partial Least Squares (PLS) path-modeling technique to test the hypotheses proposed in this research. Some findings derived from this research are contrary to previous studies owing to the specific context examined in this research. The study found significant influence of job insecurity and employees' perceptions of work engagement, and knowledge sharing. There is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. Whereas, work engagement has a significant association with knowledge sharing and burnout. Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate employees.
Suggested Reviewers:	Antonio Ariza-Montes ariza@uloyola.es
Manuscript Classifications:	100.107: Social psychological theory; 400.415: Organizational Knowledge and Learning; 400.425: Human Capital; 400.426: Human resource management; 500.511: Structural Equation Modelling

The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies

ABSTRACT

Employees' wellbeing is nowadays at the core of organizational HRM strategies, as firms have turned to grasp the significance of human resources while attaining competitive advantages. However, some external factors like localization of labor can adversely influence expatriate employees' perception of wellbeing at the firm level. The current study examines the influence of job insecurity on employee's perceptions of wellbeing, and their involvement in knowledge sharing or knowledge hiding strategies. The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working at different organizations in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian government is currently implementing localization policies, and the organizations are increasingly replacing their expatriate employees with local employees in order to avoid governmental penalties. Therefore, it is important to examine how this job insecurity might be affecting expatriate employees' perceptions of wellbeing and knowledge management behaviors. The study uses Partial Least Squares (PLS) path-modeling technique to test the hypotheses proposed in this research. Some findings derived from this research are contrary to previous studies owing to the specific context examined in this research. The study found significant influence of job insecurity and employees' perceptions of work engagement, and knowledge sharing. There is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. Whereas, work engagement has a significant association with knowledge sharing and burnout. Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate employees.

Keywords: Job insecurity, work engagement, burnout, employee wellbeing, knowledge sharing, knowledge hiding.

INTRODUCTION

The last few decades have dramatically changed the way of doing business and managing the workplace. The escalation in the use of computers and information and communication technologies has driven organizations to become more innovative and competent while adapting themselves to the currently dynamic business and work environment (Leal-Rodríguez et al. 2018). In this vein, firms are increasingly developing knowledge management (KM) systems to take advantage of the explicit and tacit knowledge resources and boost their intellectual capital. In other words, organizational design and managerial practice has significantly turned more knowledge-focused (Alavi and Leidner 2001). Besides, organizations are now striving to improve their employees's levels of wellbeing to maintain an engaged, highly motivated and competitive workforce and to be able to retain their more talented employees (Wright and Bonett 2007; Rothausen et al. 2017). There is plenty of evidence available in the management literature that emphasizes the significance of employees' wellbeing to yield improved individual and organizational outcomes and plenty of studies have examined the role of employee-related factors while designing and implementing knowledge management strategies. However, there is a scarcity of research studies aimed at examining the wellbeing perceptions of employees and their intentions to share or hide knowledge in the times of job insecurity.

As posited by Ferreira et al. (2017) further research should be directed towards the topics of global Human Resources Management (HRM) and knowledge management in international contexts, to ascertain the role played by human capital in competitively

relevant international business ventures. In this vein, this paper aims to shed light upon this research line by attempting to provide answers to the following research questions: (1) How do expatriate employees behave in terms of knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding within contexts of job insecurity? and (2) how does these employees' perception of wellbeing determine or influence their willingness to rely on knowledge sharing or knowledge hiding behaviors?

Numerous studies have examined the relationship between job insecurity and individual engagement (Lu et al. 2014) or work engagement (De Spiegelaere et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2014; Moshoeu and Geldenhuys 2015). Other authors have also inquired the link between job insecurity and negative outcomes as burnout effects (Schaufeli and Greenglass 2001; Bosman et al. 2005; De Cuyper et al. 2012; Aybas et al. 2015; Bitmis and Ergeneli 2015; Blom et al. 2018). However, there is sparse research available that examines the effect of employees' wellbeing perceptions on their intentions to share or hide knowledge within contexts of job insecurity. For this reason, the current study uses employee engagement and burnout as positive and negative behaviors respectively to approach the concept of perceived wellbeing. Subsequently, these variables are related to the employees' knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding intentions. Thus, this paper proposes an original theoretical model that examines expatriate employees' perceptions of wellbeing, approached through their levels of engagement and burnout caused by job insecurity. This model subsequently examines the role of both facets of wellbeing in predicting the employees' knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding intentions. Furthermore, this paper also examines the direct influence of job insecurity on expatriate employee's knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors.

This study is carried out upon the particular context of expatriates. Concretely, it relies on a sample of 265 expatriate employees working in Saudi Arabia. As posited by Connelly (2010), the most common profile for an expatriate, namely the 'traditional expatriate' is that person that works for a multinational corporation that comprises a rather large international workforce, a corporate-level internationalization strategy and an exhaustively detailed set of expatriation policies. Expatriates. There are plenty of studies that assess HRM issues in the context of expatriates working in Saudi Arabia. However, very scarce studies attempt to empirically assess knowledge sharing behavior among this particular context (i.e., Ewers, 2013; Dulayami et al., 2015; Ali et al., 2018), and none of them focuses on the ties between job insecurity, perceived wellbeing and knowledge sharing/hiding behaviors.

This manuscript is organized as follows: section 2 provides a conceptual framework useful both for academics and practitioners that intend to explore the links existing between job insecurity, the two wellbeing facets –work engagement and burnout and the two intentions –knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding–. The third section describes the methodology. The fourth section brings the empirical results of the study. And finally, the fifth section discusses the main implications arising from the analysis as well as several limitations and future lines of research.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Conceptual delimitation of the variables under assessment

2.1.1. Job Insecurity

The conceptualization of job insecurity is a central question in the human resources management literature. With this regard, Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) developed an exhaustive review of this concept. According to these authors, job insecurity can be defined as the employee's fear of potential loss of continuity in a certain job that may range from permanently losing the job itself to losing certain job characteristics that are positively valued or considered important by the job-holder. Among the most critical sources of threat, Greenhalgh (1983) emphasizes the importance of perceived organizational decline. This author argues that employees are normally able to identify when their organization has entered in a decline stage. Employees also know that such organizational decline frequently bring adjustments that are likely to affect their continuity within their current job positions. Fears alike may arise in response to the threat of a potential reorganization. Coherently with this approach, in a recent study entitled "The hidden face of job insecurity", Gallie et al. (2017) posit that job insecurity not only comprises the employees' fear of losing their job, but it should, on the contrary, encompass too the employees' anxiety about potential threats to their job status. Moreover, as Abildgaard et al. (2018) state, one of the most critical consequences of organizational restructuring, and especially downsizing processes, is uncertainty regarding the future features and content of the job (qualitative job insecurity) as well as uncertainty about how longer will the employee remain within the job position in question (quantitative job insecurity).

2.1.2. Employee's Wellbeing

The conceptualization of employee's wellbeing is quite vague. Warr (1987, 1990) did an extensive review of the concept of employee's wellbeing and proposes employee's

mental health as an indicator of 'affective wellbeing'. Diener (1984) has also conceptualized employee's wellbeing as 'subjective wellbeing' described by employees' overall experience in life, which is reported through individual's self-described happiness. At the organizational context, job satisfaction is considered to be the most common predictor of employees' perceptions of wellbeing and happiness (Wright 2005). Employees' perceptions and behaviors towards the organization they work for determine their perceptions of wellbeing at work. Therefore, positive behaviors like job satisfaction, loyalty and work engagement indicate positive perceptions of wellbeing, whereas negative behaviors like burnout and turnover intentions represent negative perceptions of wellbeing. The current study uses employees' engagement as a positive behavior, and burnout as a negative behavior towards perceptions of wellbeing. Employees' engagement is extensively used in research related to employees' behavior. In this vein, Schaufeli et al. (2006, p. 702), define engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption". The present study uses two dimensions of employees' engagement, including job engagement and organizational engagement, as proposed by Saks (2006), and two dimensions of job burnout including, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, as proposed by Maslach and Jackson (1981).

2.1.3. Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing refers to the exchange of explicit and tacit knowledge among employees (Nonaka 1994). Aizpurúa et al. (2011) describe knowledge sharing at the workplace as the process through which the knowledge an employee possesses is turned into a form that others can grasp, absorb, and exploit. Knowledge sharing is very important for mobilizing the flow of knowledge assets within the organization (Wang et al. 2008) that

might lead to knowledge creation, knowledge application and and a potential increase in innovation outcomes at individual, group and organizational levels (Pinho et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2014). Knowledge sharing practices comprise the open sharing of knowledge between all employees at different levels and departments, networked formally or informally within the organizations (Want et al. 2008). Similarly, Lin (2007, p. 315) defines knowledge sharing as "the exchange of employee knowledge, experiences, and skills through the whole department or organization. KS comprises a set of shared understandings related to providing employees access to relevant information and building and using knowledge networks within organizations". Nowadays, organizations rely on rigorous knowledge management systems through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to promote knowledge sharing among employees.

2.1.4. Knowledge Hiding

Knowledge hiding in relatively a new concept in the field of knowledge management. Traditionally, majority of research focuses on knowledge sharing, some readers might confuse between knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding by considering knowledge hiding as an intention to not share the knowledge. Knowledge hiding is not simply the lack of knowledge sharing, rather it is an intentional effort to conceal or withhold knowledge required by some other (Connelly et al. 2012; Cerne et al. 2014; Connelly and Zweig 2015; Bogilovic et al. 2017). Despite all the firms' endeavors and investments in KM systems and practices, knowledge hiding remains a prevalent behavior among employees. With this regard, Pan et al. (2018) report that 76% of employees in the

USA and 46% of Chinese employees tend to engage in knowledge hiding practices at their workplace.

Knowledge hiding is practiced by employees in three forms; playing dumb, rationalized hiding, and evasive hiding (Connelly et al. 2012). Playing dumb means when somebody pretends that he or she does not know when someone requests any specific piece of information or knowledge. Rationalized hiding occurs when the knowledge hider explains the rationale being hiding the knowledge. Evasive hiding happens when someone pretends knowledge seekers that he or she will share the information even when he or she is intending to conceal it (Connelly et al. 2012).

2.2. Links between Job Insecurity, Work Engagement and Burnout

There is a considerable amount of research available in the academic literature that examines the influences of job insecurity on employees' behavior (Cobb and Kasl 1977; Ashford et al. 1989; Lawrence and Kacmar 2017). The psychological stress theory by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), relates job insecurity to employee's subjective assessment of job risk and the consequences of job loss (Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Hartley et al. 1991). The psychological stress theory, posited by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), relates job insecurity to employee's subjective assessment of job risk and the consequences of job loss (Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Hartley et al. 1991). Job insecurity is often perceived by employees as a threat that may exert severe adverse effects on their mental health and subjective wellbeing (Cobb and Kasl 1977; Ashford et al. 1989; Hartley et al. 1991). Job insecurity reduces employees' loyalty to the organization. Moreover, it increases negative behaviors and decreases positive behaviors among employees (Hallier and Lyon 1996). Job insecurity is related to employees' perception of losing their job and become unemployed

(De Witte 1997, 1999). This author describes two dimensions of job insecurity: cognitive and affective. The cognitive dimension of job insecurity is related to the perception of potential job loss, whereas the affective dimension comprises the employee's fear of job loss (De Witte 2000). In addition, Hallier and Lyon (1996) believe that job insecurity contributes to reduce positive behaviors (i.e., job satisfaction) and to increase negative behaviors (i.e., intentions to quit job) among employees. Moreover, De Witte (2005) posits that job insecurity increases strain for the worker involved, and creates negative energy among employees. Other studies point that job insecurity brings an escalation in employees' turnover and health complaints, and a significant reduction of job satisfaction, work engagement (Naswall et al. 2005). Several studies like the ones developed by De Cuyper and De Witte (2005), De Cuyper et al. (2008) and Stander and Rothmann (2010) found job insecurity to be negatively related to employees' engagement. On the basis of the foregoing, this paper proposes the following hypothesis:

H1: Job insecurity is negatively related to expatriate employee's work engagement.

Burnout is defined by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as a syndrome characterized by deep feelings of emotional exhaustion (feeling emotionally overwhelmed and exhausted by work), depersonalization (an impassive and impersonal response towards others), and reduced personal accomplishment (a feeling of reduced competence and achievement in one's work). According to these authors, people firstly experience emotional exhaustion due to over work-load, then their work relationships starts to be affected by that burnout and a break-down phase towards other people begins. When they realize their

desensitization, they get the feeling as if they were not sufficient for their job and subsequently they label themselves as unsuccessful.

With this regard, Burgard et al. (2012) explain that job insecurity provokes stress and raises expatriate employee's levels of anxiety and depression. Hence, burnout is considered a response to emotional or interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach and Jackson 1981, 1996; Mustafa et al. 2007), and also involves an erosion of engagement with one's job (Maslach et al. 2001).

Expatriates already experience considerable levels of stress and mental exhaustion in their jobs as they often work longer hours and should accomplish challenging tasks within the context of a foreign country, where they might feel hard to culturally fit and establish roots. Localization policies can be a significant additional stressor that may impact on their current and future work prospects and on their personal lives as well. Hence, we hypothesize:

H2: Job insecurity is positively related to expatriate employee's burnout.

2.3. Links between Job Insecurity, Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Hiding

Knowledge sharing occupies a central role in employee-related knowledge management research. Organizations that realize the significance of knowledge management considers knowledge sharing as an important factor in evaluating employee's performance. Therefore, in ideal conditions, employees tend to share their knowledge with other colleagues in order to gain maximum benefits from the organization and learning from their colleagues as well. However, in the situation of job insecurity, when employees are dominated by negative perceptions and energy about organizations, employees tend to not to share their knowledge. According to Nonaka (1994) and Bock et al. (2005), sharing

explicit and implicit knowledge shapes a voluntary behavior from employees, and when employees are having negative energy they do not engage in such kind of voluntary behavior. Moreover, since knowledge is perceived as power and competitive weapon of employees when feel their job insecure, they try to secure their competitive advantage by not sharing their knowledge with their co-workers. We can therefore, propose the hypothesis below.

H3: Job insecurity is negatively related to expatriate employees' knowledge sharing behavior.

Knowledge is a key source of power for employees (Foucault 1980; Townley 1993), and employees make their own decision for sharing or hiding knowledge on the basis of different organizational factors (Heizmann and Olsson 2015). When employees perceive that their job is insecure, they might try to hide their knowledge from other colleagues to maintain their expert power and secure their job (Hinkin and Schriesheim 1989; Raven 2008). Since employees tend to feel worried and anxious due to the influence of certain organizational factors that threat their job security, in an attempt to compete with their colleagues and to secure their job, employees may hide their knowledge, considering knowledge to be their competitive power. Serenko and Bontis (2016) also hold that job insecurity increases expatriate employee's intentions to hide knowledge. Based on the above arguments, the current study proposes the following hypothesis.

H4: Job insecurity is positively related to expatriate employees' knowledge hiding behavior.

2.4. Links between Work Engagement, Burnout and Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Burnout is defined as a syndrome characterized by feelings of emotional exhaustion (feeling emotionally overwhelmed and exhausted by work), depersonalization (an

impassive and impersonal response towards others), and reduced personal accomplishment (a feeling of reduced competence and achievement in one's work). Burnout is a response to emotional or interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach and Jackson 1981, 1996; Mustafa et al. 2007), and also involves an erosion of engagement with one's job (Maslach et al. 2001). Since employee's work engagement is a positive behavior, it may have the power to change the nature of burnout among employees. Coherently, previous studies also suggest a negative association between employee's engagement and burnout. For instance, Schaufeli et al. (2002) noted a negative association between employee's engagement and burnout. Similarly, Schaufeli et al. (2008) also found a negative link between these concepts. We therefore, propose the below hypothesis.

H5: Work engagement is negatively related to expatriate employee's perceptions of burnout.

Employee's work engagement is a positive behavior that is depicted in their job-related activities as well as organizational related activities. As suggested by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), engagement is "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind", and hence, the employees who feel engaged display high level of knowledge sharing like positive behaviors. In this vein, several studies have linked employee's engagement with high level of intentions to share knowledge. For instance, Cabrera et al. (2006) and Foss, et al. (2009) found a positive association between employee's engagement and their knowledge sharing behaviors. Thus, coherently with Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), the employees who feel engaged with work may display higher levels of productivity and knowledge shareing behaviors.

Therefore, knowledge sharing itself is a self-motivated process that may lead employees to become more willing to share their expertise with their colleagues and coworkers only when they are dedicated to their work and enthusiastic about their organization (Fatima and Khan 2017). Such knowledge exchange develops the capability of an organization to acquire competencies useful while building organizational competitive advantages (Reid 2003). In this line, it is worth noting the importance of implicating and motivating expatriate employees to share their knowledge with local employees or other expatriates. Hence, the receivers of knowledge must have the ability to apply this knowledge, generating with this a competitive advantage. We therefore, propose the following hypothesis.

H6: Work engagement is positively related to employee's knowledge sharing behavior.

2.5. The link between Employee Burnout and Knowledge Hiding

The concept of knowledge hiding is not new, it is as old as the field of knowledge management itself (Davenport 1997; Davenport and Prusak 1998). However, over the decades, researchers mainly focused on knowledge sharing instead of knowledge hiding, considering the overlapping nature of both constructs. Knowledge hiding is however, a different construct, it is not just a lack knowledge sharing. As suggested by Bogilovic et al. (2017), knowledge hiding implies an intentional effort to conceal or withhold knowledge required by some other. Knowledge hiding is a negative behavior induced by some other negative perceptions hold by the employee. In this way, employees can feel more secure while intentionally hiding tacit and explicit knowledge (e.g. skills, expertise, know-how, documents, videos, reports, among others) because their co-workers will not be able to

discover and exploit these feebleness and opportunities, as they could if all this information were divulged (Černe et al. 2014).

Since burnout is a negative employee's behavior, it motivates employees to hide their knowledge from other employees in order to punish or affect organizational effectiveness.

H7: Burnout is positively related to expatriate employee's knowledge hiding behavior.

Hence, the conceptual model of this study is presented below in Figure 1. The independent variable is job insecurity, whereas the dependent variables are work engagement, burnout, knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. The conceptual model shows negative links between job insecurity and work engagement and knowledge sharing, whereas positive association is presented between job insecurity, burnout and knowledge hiding behavior. Work engagement is also having negative influence on employee burnout perceptions.

Insert Figure 1 about here

METHOD

3.1. Sample and data collection

The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working in different organizations in Saudi Arabia through online survey questionnaire. Participation in the survey questionnaire was voluntary and the respondents were assured regarding the confidentiality and anonymity of the data. A total of 265 valid responses were received in

this research, which is quite sufficient as per criteria suggested by (Faul et al. 2007) through statistical power analysis using the G* 3.1.9.2 software. Therefore, the sample size is quite adequate for this kind of research. The data is collected from respondents belonging to diverse socio-economic backgrounds in terms of gender, age, education, designation and experience.

3.2. Measures and Instruments

The measurement instruments used in this study are borrowed from different researches identified during literature review. All measures are rated on 5-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). The job insecurity instrument is taken form De Witte (2000) containing 4 items, used by Vander Elst et al. (2014). Employee engagement is measured through a scale developed by Saks (2006), comprising 6 items each for job engagement and organizational engagement. Job burnout is measured using Maslach and Jackson's (1981) scale followed by Choi et al. (2012). The study uses two dimensions of job burnout: emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, comprising 4 items each. The instrument for knowledge sharing is taken from Huang (2009), encompassing 4 items. The instrument to measure knowledge hiding is also taken from previously published researches. The instrument is shaped by 3 items.

3.3. Data analysis

Structural equation modeling (SEM) comprehends two types, i.e., covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM) and variance-based SEM or partial least squares SEM (PLS-SEM; also called PLS path-modeling). CB-SEM, which is one of the maximum-likelihood modeling or factor-based techniques (e.g., LISREL, AMOS, EQS, Mplus, etc.), relies on the overall

fit of the proposed model by goodness-of-fit tests, and is suitable for confirmatory studies. On the contrary, PLS-SEM is one of the multiple linear regression modeling techniques (e.g., SmartPLS, WarpPLS, PLS-Graph, and ADANCO), that relies on the maximization of the explained variance of the dependent variables, and is suitable for exploratory studies (Astrachan et al. 2014).

This study employs partial least squares structure equation modeling (PLS-SEM), a multivariate analysis technique (Henseler et al. 2015; Richter et al. 2015; Sarstedt et al. 2017) to estimate the measurement and structural model. PLS-SEM has its distinct features compared to CB-SEM. For instance, PLS-SEM does not have minimal requirements of the restrictive assumptions such as measurement scales, sample size, and distributional assumptions imposed by CB-SEM (Astrachan et al. 2014).

The use of PLS-SEM in this study is appropriate because: (1) this study focuses on prediction and explaining the variance in key target constructs (e.g., knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding); (2) the research model shows a complex structure according to the type of hypothetical relationships and level of multi-dimensionality (first- and second-order constructs); (3) the relationship among the main constructs of the study is believed to be in early stage of theory development and thus creates the opportunity where new phenomena are to be explored; (4) using of latent variables scores in the subsequent analysis of predictive relevance, particularly in the implementation of the two-stage

approach for modeling the multidimensionality of work engagement and burnout; and finally, (5) this study benefits of the advantages of PLS-SEM in terms of less rigorous requirement of restrictive assumption as it enables researchers to create and estimate such models without imposing additional limiting constraints (Hair et al. 2017). This study employs the SmartPLS 3 software (Ringle et al. 2015) for the PLS analysis.

RESULTS

4.1. Measurement Model

The evaluation of the measurement model focuses on the psychometric properties of reliability, validity and dimensionality of each construct. These were assessed prior to undertaking hypothesis testing via exploratory factor analysis (EFA), by assessing the reliabilities, average variance extracted (AVE), square root of the average variance extracted, and interconstruct correlations. This study operationalizes work engagement and job burnout as second-order reflective composite constructs. This way, work engagement is modeled as a composite reflective construct (Mode A), made up of two first-order reflective dimensions: job engagement and organization engagement. As in Table 1, the two first-order reflective dimensions reflect the higher-order composite construct. Similarly, this study measures job burnout as a second-order reflective composite construct consisting of two first-order reflective dimensions: depersonalization and emotional exhaustion. All other constructs are modeled as first-order reflective constructs.

The assessment of the individual reliability of the items depends on examining the standardized factor loadings. A popular rule of thumb is to accept items with loadings over

0.707 (Fornell and Larcker 1981). This study follows Kock's (2014) recommendation to use one-tailed *p* values. Table 1 provides the standardized factor loadings for all first order reflective constructs of each measurement item. The *t*-test of all the loadings is at the $p <$ .001 level. All the loadings are significant with few exceptional cases that are: J-In2 and EE-OE3. These two items, which have loadings below 0.7 were found problematic and removed from further analysis.

The reliability and convergent validity of the constructs is evaluated by analyzing the Cronbach's alpha, Dijkstra-Henseler's rho (ρA), and composite reliability of the indicator. A recommended value of 0.70 (in exploratory research, 0.60 to 0.70 is considered acceptable) is considered as a threshold value for all these three approaches. The scores of Cronbach's alpha, Dijkstra-Henseler's rho (ρA), and composite reliability are above the minimum threshold, indicating adequate convergence or internal consistency (Table 1). Table 2 and Table 3 show the means, standard deviation, correlation for all the first-order and second-order level constructs respectively and the square root of the AVE on the diagonals. Mean values depict that most constructs are generally above their respective mid-point, while correlations among the independent constructs are relatively low. Thus, multicollinearity was not a concern in this study as shown in Table 1 (Hair et al. 2017).

Insert Table 1 about here

The average variance extracted (AVE) provides an assessment of convergent validity. Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommend an AVE value ≥0.50. This means that 50% or more of the indicator variance should be accounted for. Consistent with this

suggestion, all the first-order as well as second-order level constructs have an AVE value above this minimum as shown in Table 1.

This study assesses the discriminant validity using three approaches: (1) Fornell-Larcker criterion; (2) cross loading; and, (3) the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT). The correlation matrix in Table 2 and Table 3 show that, for each pair of constructs, the AVE square root of each construct is higher than the absolute value of their correlation (Fornell and Larcker 1981). The results of the cross loading of all items loaded higher on their respective constructs than on the other constructs and the cross-loading differences are much higher than the suggested threshold of 0.10 (Gefen and Straub 2005). Finally, in all cases the HTMT values are below the threshold of 0.85 or 0.90 (see the diagonal values in Table 2 and Table 3). These results confirm that the discriminant validity is present in this study.

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Table 3 about here

4.2. Structural Model

This study follows the recommendations in Hair et al. (2017) to evaluate the structural model. First, potential collinearity is assessed. The only result for assessing collinearity issues is the variance inflation factor (VIF) value. Table 1 shows minimal collinearity in the structural model as all the values of VIF are below the common cutoff threshold of 5 to 10 (Hair et al. 2017).

Second, the structural model predictability is computed by means of variance explained R^2 values for three dependent composite constructs as shown in Table 4.

Third, the sizes and significance of the path coefficients that represent the derived hypotheses are examined. Following Hair et al. (2017), the significance levels of the path coefficients are obtained using the bootstrapping procedure (with a number of 5000 bootstrap samples and 135 bootstrap cases). Table 4 provides the path coefficients, *t*-statistics, significance level, *p*-values as well as the accompanying bootstrap confidence intervals at 95 percent. An analysis of path coefficients and levels of significance shows that all hypotheses are accepted except H4.

Fourth, the blindfolding procedure produces the Q^2 values, which applies a sample re-use technique that omits part of the data matrix and uses the model estimates to predict the omitted part. For PLS-SEM models, a Q^2 value larger than zero in the cross-validated redundancy report indicates predictive relevance. Table 4 provides the Q^2 values of all three dependent constructs. All Q^2 values are considerably above zero, thus providing support for the model's predictive relevance in terms of out-of-sample prediction (Hair et al. 2012).

Finally, this study also calculates the overall model fit through standardized root-mean square residual (SRMR) as the root mean square discrepancy between the observed correlation and the model implied correlations. This study follows Henseler et al. (2015) and refers to the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) as an index for model validation. Values below 0.08 are favorable in this instance (Hu and Bentler 1999). While the model estimation with PLS-SEM in this study reveals a SRMR value of 0.07, which confirms the overall fit of PLS-SEM path model (Henseler et al. 2015; Hair et al. 2017).

Insert Table 4 about here
---

5. Discussion and conclusion

The objective of this study is manifold. It examines the influence of job insecurity in shaping expatriate employee's perceptions of wellbeing –engagement and burnout– and how does such perception of wellbeing develop their knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. It also assesses the direct influence of job insecurity on expatriate employee's knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. This study is conducted in the context of expatriate employees working in the currently uncertain labor market environment in Saudi Arabia, due to localization policies of the Saudi government.

Interestingly, some findings of this study do not match the findings of many previous theoretical studies owing to specific context of this study, which we believe is the strength of this research. The empirical results of this study reveal a positive association between job insecurity and knowledge sharing, which is contrary to our theoretical argument and the findings of many previous studies. However, there is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. This fact suggests that job insecurity exerts an external pressure on employees and in order to secure their job, expatriate employees tend to increase their knowledge sharing activities instead of hiding knowledge. This is in line with self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci 2001), therefore, when expatriate employees fear losing their job, they increase their engagement at work and share more knowledge. Similarly, Stander and Rothmann (2010) and Serenko and Bontis (2016) note that external pressures caused by job insecurity can change employees' behavior, leading them to tend to display more positive behaviors to secure their job.

Likewise, contrarily to what we expected, empirical results reveal a positive tie between work engagement and burnout, whereas previous studies like the one developed by Upadyaya et al. (2016) sustain that work engagement and burnout symptoms are negatively associated over time. Besides, this study found a positive and significant influence of job insecurity on employees' perceptions of wellbeing –approached by their levels of work engagement, and burnout–. Hence two questions of utmost interest arise at this point: (1) how can job insecurity be simultaneously leading to superior levels of work engagement and burnout?, and (2) Can the employees' work engagement lead them to higher levels of burnout? A possible explanation to both questions might be found in the findings of Timms et al. (2012) in their article entitled 'Burnt-out but engaged: the co-existence of psychological burnout and engagement'. These authors argue that for individuals and groups that work under pressure it is plausible that certain aspects of engagement (i.e. absorption and dedication) may coexist with burnout symptoms. Such reasoning is coherent with what studies like the ones developed by Schaufeli and Bakkers (2003) and Sonnentag (2005) uphold, mainly suggesting that work engagement and burnout constitute opposite sides of wellbeing and that poor working conditions will lead inevitably to burnout despite the employees still feel dedicated to their work (Timms et al. 2012). Furthermore, Schaufeli et al. (2008) found that the absorption dimension of work engagement also loaded with workaholism. Perhaps workaholism might be also inducing our sample respondents to remain burned but engaged, given that that workaholics tend to find their job activity compulsively enjoyable, despite they work under pressure (McMillan and O'Driscoll 2008). A possible clue to better understand this phenomenon is that those employees that feel highly engaged to their work might experience higher levels of tension

and anxiety regarding the completion of their tasks, which could ultimately end in experiencing burnout symptoms.

Moreover, coherently with what it was theorized, work engagement is shown to be positively associated to knowledge sharing. Thus, those employees that feel deeply engaged at the workplace may be more likely to rely on knowledge sharing behaviors. Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate employees. This suggests that when employees feel psychologically exhausted and burned at work, they may incur in knowledge hiding behaviors. Perhaps this might be in line with employees' complaints about "being extremely busy to share their knowledge with others". These findings are coherent with previous studies (i.e., Ford and Staples 2008; Ford et al. 2015) and provide empirical support for the ties between Work Engagement Theory and the employees' attitude and commitment towards knowledge sharing. Concretely, they reveal the relevant role of work engagement promotion and burnout prevention while driving expatriate employees' knowledge sharing behaviors.

This paper brings several important managerial and practical implications for companies. Our study sheds light upon whether expatriate employees are willing or not to share knowledge on the basis of their perceived workplace wellbeing. On the basis of our empirical results, we would recommend managers to promote a set of human resources management initiatives oriented at emphasizing expatriate employees' levels of engagement, health perception and wellbeing at the workplace (i.e., proper job design, job enrichment, avoiding lack of meaningfulness, providing adequate compensation policies, etc.). This is in line with prior managerial literature that assumes employees' engagement to be at the core of motivation and exerts a critical role in both individual and organizational

performance (Bakker and Bal 2010; Ford et al 2015). In sum, the more a company want their expatriates to be willing to remain involved in knowledge sharing behaviors, the more managers should focus on reducing burnout drivers, improving work-related psychological conditions (i.e., diminishing job insecurity and uncertainty) and assuring that expatriates are highly engaged to their work. This implies that those firms that ignore the benefits of assuring proper working conditions and job engagement among their expatriate employees, may find their knowledge-sharing initiatives to deteriorate.

This research has certain limitations that we aim to highlight. For instance, the data was only collected from 265 expatriate employees working in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, researchers should be carefully while generalizing these findings to other countries across the globe. A large sample size could also increase the validity of the findings of this research. In addition, a comparative analysis between the perceptions of local and expatriate employees' perception of job insecurity, work engagement, burnout, knowledge sharing and hiding behavior might provide interesting findings in future. Some other constructs can also be used to explain why expatriate employees are willing to engage at workplace and share knowledge despite of having a high level of job insecurity. Moreover, future studies could examine the moderating role of cultural aspects (religion or customs) or physical aspects (installations or attraction of the destination country) in the expatriate employees' wellbeing. As well as, knowing if hiding knowledge could bring associated problems when the expatriate employee returns to his country for illicit behavior. On the other hand, future research may also study the role of family well-being in the expatriate dissatisfaction.

REFERENCES

Abildgaard, J. S., Nielsen, K., & Sverke, M. (2018). Can job insecurity be managed? Evaluating an organizational-level intervention addressing the negative effects of restructuring. *Work & Stress*, *32*(2), 105-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1367735

Aizpurúa, L. I., Saldaña, P. E. Z., & Saldaña, A. Z. (2011). Learning for sharing: an empirical analysis of organizational learning and knowledge sharing. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(4), 509-518. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-011-0206-z

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, *25*(1), 107-136. DOI: 10.2307/3250961

Ali, I., Ali, M., Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., & Albort-Morant, G. (2018). The role of knowledge spillovers and cultural intelligence in enhancing expatriate employees' individual and team creativity. *Journal of Business Research.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.012

Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management journal*, *32*(4), 803-829. https://doi.org/10.5465/256569

Astrachan, C. B., Patel V. K., & Wanzenried G. (2014). A Comparative Study of CB-SEM and PLS-SEM for Theory development in Family Firm Research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 5*, 116-128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.12.002

Aybas, M., Elmas, S., & Dündar, G. (2015). Job insecurity and burnout: The moderating role of employability. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *7*(9), 195-203.

Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(1), 189-206. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X402596

Bitmiş, M. G., & Ergeneli, A. (2015). How psychological capital influences burnout: the mediating role of job insecurity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *207*, 363-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.106

Blom, V., Richter, A., Hallsten, L., & Svedberg, P. (2018). The associations between job insecurity, depressive symptoms and burnout: The role of performance-based self-esteem. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *39*(1), 48-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X15609118

Bock, G.W., Zmud, R.W., Kim, Y.G., & Lee, J.N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: examining the rules of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 87-111. DOI: 10.2307/25148669

Bogilovic, S., Cerne, M., & Skerlavaj, M. (2017). Hiding behind a mask? Cultural intelligence, knowledge hiding, and individual and team creativity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *26*(5), 710-723. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1337747

Bosman, J., Rothmann, S., & Buitendach, J. H. (2005). Job insecurity, burnout and work engagement: the impact of positive and negative effectivity. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *31*(4), p-48. DOI:10.4102/sajip.v31i4.199

Cabrera, A., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). Determinants of individual engagement in knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*, 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500404614

Cerne, M., Nerstad, C., Dysvik, A., & Skerlavaj, M. (2014). What goes around comes around: Knowledge hiding, perceived motivational climate, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*, 172–192. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0122

Choi, S, Cheong, K. J., & Feinberg, R. A. (2012). Moderating effects of supervisor support, monetary rewards, and career paths on the relationship between job burnout and turnover intentions in the context of call centers. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *22*(5), 492-516. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604521211281396

Cobb S., & Kasl S. V. (1977). *Termination*: *The Consequences of Job Loss*. Cincinnati: US Department of Health Education and Welfare.

Connelly, B. L. (2010). Transnational entrepreneurs, worldchanging entrepreneurs, and ambassadors: a typology of the new breed of expatriates. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *6*(1), 39-53. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-009-0116-5

Connelly, C. E., & Zweig, D. (2015). How perpetrators and targets construe knowledge hiding in organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *24*, 479–489. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.931325

Connelly, C. E., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2012). Knowledge hiding in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 64–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.737

Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know. *Harvard Business Press*.

De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: mediator or moderator of the relationship between type of contract and various outcomes. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *31*(4), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v31i4.211

De Cuyper, N., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., De Witte, H., & Alarco, B. (2008). Employability and employees' wellbeing: Mediation by job insecurity. *Applied Psychology: An International Journal, 57*, 488–509. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00332.

De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., De Witte, H., Niesen, W., & Van Hootegem, G. (2014). On the relation of job insecurity, job autonomy, innovative work behaviour and the mediating effect of work engagement. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 23*(3), 318-330. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12079

De Witte, H. (1997). *Long term job insecurity as a stressor: Its impact on satisfaction and commitment.* Paper presented at the 8th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Verona, Italy.

De Witte, H. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*, 155–177. DOI: 10.1080/135943299398302

De Witte, H. (2000). Arbeidsethos en Jobonzekerheid: Meting en Gevolgen voor Welzijn, Tevredenheid en Inzet op het Werk. 325-50 in R. Bouwen, K. De Witte, H. De Witte and T. Taillieu (eds)Van Groep naar Gemeenschap. LiberAmicorum Prof. Dr. Leo Lagrou.Leuven: arant.

De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. SA *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *31*(4), 1-6.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95,* 542–575. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542

Dulayami, S. T. H., & Robinson, L. (2015). The individual and the collective: Factors affecting knowledge sharing in Saudi Arabian companies. *Journal of Documentation*, 71(1), 198-209.

Ewers, M. C. (2013). From knowledge transfer to learning: The acquisition and assimilation of human capital in the United Arab Emirates and the other Gulf States. *Geoforum*, 46, 124-137.

Fatima, A., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Do Hope Foster Innovative Work Behavior through Employee Engagement and Knowledge Sharing Behavior? A Conservation of Resources Approach Using MPLUS tool. *Business & Economic Review, 9*(4), 181-212. DOI: dx.doi.org/10.22547/BER/9.4.9

Faul, F. Erdfelder, E. Lang, A., & Bucher, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavioral Research Methods, 39*(2), 179-191.

Ferreira, J. J., Ratten, V., & Dana, L. P. (2017). Knowledge spillover-based strategic entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(1), 161-167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-016-0415-6

Ford, D., Myrden, S. E., & Jones, T. D. (2015). Understanding "disengagement from knowledge sharing": engagement theory versus adaptive cost theory. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(3), 476-496. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2014-0469

Ford, D., Myrden, S. E., & Jones, T. D. (2015). Understanding "disengagement from knowledge sharing": engagement theory versus adaptive cost theory. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(3), 476-496. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2014-0469

Ford, D. P., & Staples, D. S. (2008). What is knowledge sharing from the informer's perspective?. *International Journal of Knowledge Management (IJKM)*, *4*(4), 1-20.

Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39–50. DOI: 10.2307/3151312

Foss, N. J., Minbaeva, D. B., Pedersen, T., & Reinholt, M. (2009). Encouraging knowledge sharing among employees: How job design matters? *Human Resources Management*, *48*(6), 871-893. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.20320

Foucault, M. (Ed.) (1980), *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, 1972-1977, Pantheon Books, New York, NY.

Gallie, D., Felstead, A., Green, F., & Inanc, H. (2017). The hidden face of job insecurity. *Work, employment and society, 31*(1), 36-53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017015624399

Gefen, D., & Straub, D. (2005). A Practical Guide to Factorial Validity Using PLS-Graph: Tutorial and Annotated Example," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *16*, 91–105. DOI: 10.17705/1CAIS.01605

Greenhalgh, L. (1983). Managing the job insecurity crisis. *Human Resource Management, 22*(4), 431-444. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930220409

Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(3), 438-448. DOI: 10.2307/258284

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2012). Partial least squares: the better approach to structural equation modeling?.

Hallier J., & Lyon P. (1996). Job Insecurity and Employee Commitment: Managers' Reactions to the Threat and Outcomes of Redundancy Selection. *British Journal of Management, 7*(1), 107-123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.1996.tb00109.x

Hartley, J., Jacobson, D., Klandermans, B., & van Vuuren, T. (1991). *Job Insecurity: Coping with Jobs at Risk.* London: Sage.

Heizmann, H., & Olsson, M. R. (2015). Power matters: the importance of Foucault's power/knowledge as a conceptual lens in KM research and practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(4), 756-769. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2014-0511

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the academy of marketing science, 43*(1), 115-135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power. *Journal of applied psychology, 74*(4), 561. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.561

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Kock, N. (2015). One-tailed or two-tailed P values in PLS-SEM?. *International Journal of e-Collaboration, 11*(2), 1-7. DOI: 10.4018/ijec.2015040101

Lawrence, E. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2017). Exploring the impact of job insecurity on employees' unethical behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 27*(1), 39-70. https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.58

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. New York: Springer.

Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., Ariza-Montes, A. J., Morales-Fernández, E., & Albort-Morant, G. (2018). Green innovation, indeed a cornerstone in linking market requests and business performance. Evidence from the Spanish automotive components industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 129*, 185-193. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2017.07.021

Lu, C. Q., Wang, H. J., Lu, J. J., Du, D. Y., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Does work engagement increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(2), 142-152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.12.004

Maslach, C., & Jackson S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*(2), 99-113. http://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205

McMillan, L. H., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2008). The wellsprings of workaholism: A comparative analysis of the explanatory theories. The long work hours culture: Causes, consequences and choices, 85-111. DOI: 10.1016/B978-1-84855-038-4.00004-X

Moshoeu, A. N., & Geldenhuys, D. J. (2015). Job insecurity, organisational commitment and work engagement among staff in an open distance learning institution. *Southern African Business Review*, *19*(1), 22-43.

Naswall, K., Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2005). The moderating role of personality characteristics on the relationship between job insecurity and strain. *Work & Stress, 19*, 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500057850

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, *5*(1), 14-37. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14

Pan, W., Zhang, Q., Teo, T. S., & Lim, V. K. (2018). The dark triad and knowledge hiding. *International Journal of Information Management*, *42*, 36-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.05.008

Pinho, I., Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2012). Improving knowledge management processes: a hybrid positive approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 16(2)*, 215-242. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271211218834

Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *8*(1),1-22. **DOI: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.**2008.00159.x

Reid, F., (2003). Creating a knowledge sharing culture among diverse business units. *Employment Relations Today, 30*(3), 43-49. https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.10097

Richter, N. F. Cepeda, G. Roldan, J. L., & Ringle, C. M. (2015). European management research using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Journal of Management, 33*(1), 1-3. DOI: 10.1016/j.emj.2014.12.001

Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J. M. (2015). SmartPLS 3. Boenningstedt: SmartPLS GmbH. http://www.smartpls.com.

Roskies, E., & Louis-Guerin, C. (1990). Job Insecurity in Managers: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(5), 345-359. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110503

Rothausen, T. J., Henderson, K. E., Arnold, J. K., & Malshe, A. (2017). Should I stay or should I go? Identity and well-being in sensemaking about retention and turnover. *Journal of Management, 43*(7), 2357-2385. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206315569312

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, *52*(1), 141-166. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

Saks A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*(7) 600-619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2017). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling.* In C. Homburg, M. Klarmann, & A. Vomberg (Eds.), Handbook of Market Research (in press). Heidelberg: Springer.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary Manual*, Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701-716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471

Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-roma, V., & Bakker A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies,3*(1),71-92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-being? *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57*(2), 173-203. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x

Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Introduction to special issue on burnout and health. *Psychology & Health, 16*(5), 501-510. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440108405523

Serenko. A., & Bontis. N. (2016). Understanding counterproductive knowledge behavior: antecedents and consequences of intra-organizational knowledge hiding. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 20*, 1199-1224. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2016-0203

Sonnentag, S. (2005). Burnout research: Adding an off-work and day-level perspective. *Work & Stress, 19*(3), 271-275. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500386473

Stander, M. W., & Rothmann, S. (2010). Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(1),1-8. doi: 10.11611/yead.327329

Timms, C., Brough, P., & Graham, D. (2012). Burnt-out but engaged: the co-existence of psychological burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(3), 327-345. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211223338

Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 518-545. DOI: 10.2307/258907

Upadyaya, K., Vartiainen, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2016). From job demands and resources to work engagement, burnout, life satisfaction, depressive symptoms, and occupational health. *Burnout Research, 3*(4), 101-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2016.10.001

Vander Elst, T., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2014). The Job Insecurity Scale: A psychometric evaluation across five European countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23*(3), 364-380. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.745989

Wang, C. L., Ahmed, P. K., & Rafiq, M. (2008). Knowledge management orientation: construct development and empirical validation. *European Journal of Information Systems, 17(3)*, 219-235. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2008.12

Wang, S., Noe, R. A., & Wang, Z. M. (2014). Motivating knowledge sharing in knowledge management systems: A quasi–field experiment. *Journal of Management, 40*(4), 978-1009. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311412192

Warr, P. (1987). *Work, unemployment, and mental health.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*, 193–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x

Wright, T. A. (2005). The role of "happiness" in organizational research: Past, present and future directions. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well-being*, Vol. 4: 225-268. Amsterdam: JAI. DOI: 10.1016/S1479-3555(04)04006-5

Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, *33*(2), 141-160. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306297582

TABLE 1

Measurement Model Results at First-order Level and Second-order Level.

Constructs	Code	Item wording	S.L	S.E	*t*-value [a, b]	α	ρ_A	C.R	AVE [c]	VIF
Step I: Results of the assessment of measurement model for first-order constructs										
Job Insecurity						0.86	0.89	0.91	0.78	1.37
	J-In1	Chances are I will soon lose my job.	0.86	0.04	23.77					
	J-In2*	I am sure I can keep my job.								
	J-In3	I feel insecure about the future of my job.	0.88	0.02	45.65					
	J-In4	I think I might lose my job in the near future.	0.91	0.02	44.98					
Job engagement						0.70	0.72	0.82	0.53	1.64
	EE-JE1	I really "throw" myself into my job.	0.79	0.05	16.83					
	EE-JE2	Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time.	0.73	0.06	12.72					
	EE-JE3	This job is all consuming; I am totally into it.	0.80	0.04	20.90					
	EE-JE4	My mind often wanders and I think of other things when doing my job.	0.59	0.11	5.42					
	EE-JE5	I am highly engaged in this job.	0.86	0.06	14.63					
Organization engagement						0.82	0.85	0.87	0.57	1.58
	EE-OE1	Being a member of this organization is very captivating.	0.63	0.13	4.96					
	EE-OE2	One of the most exciting things for me is getting involved with things happening in this organization.	0.70	0.12	5.85					

	EE-OE3*	I am really not into the “goings-on” in this organization.								
	EE-OE4	Being a member of this organization make me come “alive.”	0.76	0.08	9.47					
	EE-OE-5	Being a member of this organization is exhilarating for me.	0.86	0.06	14.63					
	EE-OE-6	I am highly engaged in this organization.	0.82	0.06	13.00					
Emotional Exhaustion						0.81	0.83	0.88	0.64	2.44
	JB-EE1	I feel emotionally drained from customer service work.	0.78	0.05	14.42					
	JB-EE2	I feel used up by the end of the workday.	0.78	0.06	12.21					
	JB-EE3	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning.	0.80	0.03	26.16					
	JB-EE4	I feel burned out from customer service work.	0.84	0.04	22.26					
Depersonalization						0.83	0.85	0.88	0.66	2.48
	JB-Dep1	I have become more callous (heartless) toward customers.	0.86	0.02	45.72					
	JB-Dep2	I feel that I treat customers as if they were impersonal “objects”.	0.85	0.03	25.82					
	JB-Dep3	I worry about being callous (heartless) toward people.	0.70	0.07	9.96					
	JB-Dep4	I have become callous (heartless) toward people.	0.84	0.03	30.19					
Knowledge sharing						0.70	0.72	0.82	0.54	1.40
	KS1	I often share the reports and official documents from my work with the members of my team.	0.77	0.05	14.85					

	KS2	I always share my manuals, methodologies and models with the members of my team.	0.76	0.05	15.34					
	KS3	I often share my experience or know-how with the members of my team.	0.81	0.03	24.19					
	KS4	I always share my know-where and know-whom when prompted by the members of my team.	0.56	0.11	4.99					
Knowledge hiding						0.82	0.82	0.89	0.73	1.45
	KH1	Withhold helpful information or knowledge from my Saudi co-workers	0.85	0.02	35.22					
	KH2	Try to hide innovative achievements from my Saudi co-workers.	0.85	0.05	18.46					
	KH3	Do not transform personal knowledge and experience into organizational knowledge from my Saudi co-workers	0.87	0.02	46.29					
Step II: Results of the assessment of measurement model after generating second order constructs										
Constructs	**Code**	**Item wording**	**C.W**	**S.E**	***t*-value [a, b]**	**α**	**ρ_A**	**C.R**	**AVE [c]**	**VIF**
Work engagement						0.70	0.82	0.81	0.69	1.04
		Job engagement	0.97	0.02	60.88					
		Organization engagement	0.65	0.13	5.12					
Job burnout						0.86	0.86	0.93	0.88	1.50
		Depersonalization	0.93	0.01	78.65					
		Emotional Exhaustion	0.94	0.01	120.59					
Note: * Problematic item and removed from final analysis. S.L = Standard loadings; S.E = Standard error; [a] Test-statistics are obtained by 5000 Bootstrap runs; [b] Absolute t-values > 1.65 are one-tailed significant at 5 percent; α = Cronbach's Alpha; ρ_A = Dijstra-Henseler's										

rho; C.R = Composite reliability; AVE = Average variance extracted; [c] Percentage of variance of item explained by the latent variable; VIF = Variance inflation factor; C.W = Correlational weights.

TABLE 2
Mean, standard deviations, correlations and discriminant validity results at first-order level.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Job insecurity	3.00	0.83	*0.88*	0.40	0.30	0.62	0.62	0.40	0.65
2. Job engagement	3.35	0.64	0.30	*0.73*	0.64	0.38	0.53	0.42	0.47
3. Organization engagement	3.43	0.67	0.24	0.46	*0.76*	0.30	0.27	0.64	0.26
4. Depersonalization	2.90	0.95	0.54	0.29	0.26	*0.81*	0.90	0.38	0.79
5. Emotional exhaustion	3.15	0.86	0.53	0.40	0.21	0.75	*0.80*	0.53	0.12
6. Knowledge sharing	3.27	0.75	0.29	0.38	0.47	0.29	0.39	*0.73*	0.47
7. Knowledge hiding	2.92	0.98	0.56	0.36	0.22	0.38	0.29	0.35	*0.85*

Note: SD = Standard deviation; Diagonal and italicized elements are the square roots of the AVE (average variance extracted).
Below the diagonal elements are the correlations between the constructs values
Above the diagonal elements are the HTMT values.

TABLE 3

Mean, standard deviations, correlations and discriminant validity results at second-order level.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Job insecurity	3.00	0.83	*1.00*	0.40	0.62	0.29	0.56
2. Work engagement	3.39	0.65	0.20	*0.83*	0.50	0.54	0.42
3. Burnout	3.02	0.91	0.58	0.25	*0.94*	0.39	0.66
4. Knowledge sharing	3.27	0.75	0.29	0.49	0.37	*1.00*	0.35
5. Knowledge hiding	2.92	0.98	0.56	0.25	0.47	0.35	*1.00*

Note: SD = Standard deviation; Diagonal and italicized elements are the square roots of the AVE (average variance extracted).
Below the diagonal elements are the correlations between the constructs values
Above the diagonal elements are the HTMT values.

TABLE 4
Structural model results

Structural path	Path coefficient	S.E	*t*-value (bootstrap)	95% Confidence interval	Conclusion
Job insecurity → Work engagement	0.25*	0.13	1.92	(0.04, 0.46) Sig.	H1; supported
Job insecurity → Burnout	0.55***	0.08	6.75	(0.42, 0.68) Sig.	H2; supported
Job insecurity → Knowledge sharing	0.10**	0.04	2.54	(0.03, 0.17) Sig.	H3; supported
Job insecurity → Knowledge hiding	0.03 NSig.	0.04	0.90	(-0.04, 0.10) NSig.	H4, not supported
Work engagement → Burnout	0.14*	0.09	1.66	(0.01, 0.29) Sig.	H5, supported
Work engagement → Knowledge sharing	0.48***	0.02	24.00	(0.45, 0.51) Sig.	H6, supported
Burnout → Knowledge hiding	0.46***	0.02	23.00	(0.43, 0.49) Sig.	H7, supported
SRMR composite model = 0.07 R^2 Work engagement = 0.10; Q^2 Work engagement = 0.09 R^2 Employee burnout = 0.35; Q^2 Employee burnout = 0.29 R^2 Knowledge sharing = 0.48; Q^2 Knowledge sharing = 0.46 R^2 Knowledge hiding = 0.44; Q^2 Knowledge hiding = 0.43					
Note: $^{*}t(0.05, 4999) = 1.65$; $^{**}t(0.01, 4999) = 2.33$; $^{***}t(0.001, 4999) = 3.09$. Sig. denotes a significant direct effect at 0.05; Nsig. denotes a non-significant direct effect at 0.05(based on $t(4999)$, one-tailed test). R^2 = Determination coefficients; Q^2= Predictive relevance of endogenous (omission distance=7). Threshold for R^2 value $\geq$ 0.25 (weak); $\geq$ 0.50 (moderate); $\geq$ 0.75 (substantial). Threshold for Q^2 value $>$ 0 indicate predictive relevance.					

FIGURE 1

Conceptual Model